

a white man. In addition to that, every alien in the city of Baltimore, where a large portion of the population were aliens, was made equal to a citizen in other counties where the population almost exclusively consisted either of native born or of naturalised citizens. If any other than the aggregate population were to be taken as the basis of population, foreigners ought to be excluded also. Not being entitled to vote, they had no more right to be represented than a free negro or a slave. So far as political rights were concerned, they had none, and were entitled to none. It appeared to him that the provision now offered would operate unjustly upon many counties, though most beneficially in favor of Carroll and Washington counties. In those counties but a few hundred were lost; while in other counties, as Baltimore and Frederick counties, would lose between ten and eleven hundred. While, therefore, the proposition might operate favorably for Allegany and Washington counties, and some others, but he was satisfied it would be a serious injury to others. Why the fraction should have been changed from one-half to three-fourths, he could not conceive. In Congress it had been the practice to allow a representative for every fraction more than a moiety of the ratio. The only effect of the change would be to benefit particular counties by taking away a vote from other counties. The proposition under consideration should not be adopted, unless the Convention had determined to adopt the federal numbers; and he understood that they were agreed to adopt the aggregate population as the basis under the new Constitution.

The question was then taken on the amendment of Mr. SCHLEY, and the result was as follows:

Affirmative—Messrs. Sappington, Schley, John Newcomer, and Smith—4.

Negative—Messrs. Buchanan, Pres't., *pro tem.*, Morgan, Blakistone, Hopewell, Lee, Chambers of Kent, Mitchell, Donaldson, Dorsey, Wells, Randall, Kent, Sellman, Weems, Dalrymple, Bond, Brent of Charles, Merrick, Jenifer, Howard, Bell, Welch, Chandler, Lloyd, Dickinson, Sherwood of Talbot, Crisfield, Williams, Hicks, Goldsborough, Eccleston, Phelps, Chambers of Cecil, McCullough, Miller, McLane, Bowie, Tuck, Sprigg, McCubbin, Bowling, Spencer, George, Wright, Dirickson, McMaster, Fooks, Shriver, Gaither, Biser, Annan, McHenry, Magraw, Thawley, Stewart of Caroline, Hardecastle, Gwinn, Stewart of Baltimore city, Brent of Baltimore city, Sherwood of Baltimore city, Pressman, Ware, Fiery, Neill, Harbine, Davis, Kilgour, Brewer, Waters, Weber, Hollyday, Slicer, Fitzpatrick, Parke, Shower, Cockey, and Brown—77.

So the substitute was rejected.

The question recurred on the amendment of which Mr. MERRICK had given notice.

Mr. MERRICK waived his right for the present.

Mr. SCHLEY then offered as a substitute for said amendment, to strike out all after the words "the House of Delegates, in the first line, second section, and insert the following:

"Shall consist of sixty-seven members, to be apportioned among the several counties according to the following ratio: Every county shall elect one delegate for every seven thousand souls it may contain, and for every fraction above half of said number, there shall be allowed to every county having such excess, one additional delegate; the city of Baltimore shall be entitled to the same number of delegates as the county which shall be entitled to the largest representation, and no county shall have less than two delegates."

Mr. S. said, that the printed statement would show the ratio under this amendment to be as follows:

Counties.	Basis 7000.
Allegany, - - - -	3
Anne Arundel, - - - -	3
Howard, - - - -	2
Baltimore City, - - - -	6
Baltimore County, - - - -	6
Carroll, - - - -	3
Caroline, - - - -	2
Calvert, - - - -	2
Cecil, - - - -	3
Charles, - - - -	2
Dorchester, - - - -	3
Frederick, - - - -	6
Harford, - - - -	3
Kent, - - - -	2
Montgomery, - - - -	2
Prince George's, - - - -	3
Queen Anne's, - - - -	2
St. Mary's, - - - -	2
Somerset, - - - -	3
Talbot, - - - -	2
Washington, - - - -	4
Worcester, - - - -	3

67

Mr. SCHLEY asked the yeas and nays, (which were ordered.)

Mr. CHAMBERS, of Kent, said, that the proposition now submitted by the gentleman from Washington, (Mr. SCHLEY,) was a very different one from that upon which the Convention had just voted.

The House were aware that a very different proposition had been offered in the shape of a report by a minority of the committee, which was now upon the files of the House. This proposition approximated more nearly to that than to any other. It was quite within the range of possibility, that under a different state of things and at a different stage of the session, this proposition would not be unacceptable to some members who would certainly very much prefer the proposition contained in the second column of the printed tabular statement. It would be unpleasant now to vote against a plan which ultimately they might be disposed to advocate. If the other plan failed, and if action was deferred upon this proposition, it might receive very considerable additional support. He would submit, therefore, to the mover of the proposition, to withdraw it for the present, for these reasons.

Mr. PHELPS stated that in voting for this pro-